



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/675,670	09/30/2003	John Andrew Dankovich	AUS920030647US1	6748
35525	7590	02/23/2007	EXAMINER	
IBM CORP (YA)			PARTHASARATHY, PRAMILA	
C/O YEE & ASSOCIATES PC			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
P.O. BOX 802333				
DALLAS, TX 75380			2136	

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
3 MONTHS	02/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/675,670	DANKOVICH ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Pramila Parthasarathy	2136	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 October 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/26/2006</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to the communication 10/26/2006. No preliminary amendments were filed. Claims 1 – 22 are currently pending.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. An initialed and dated copy of Applicant's IDS form 1449 is attached to the Office action.

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

3. Claims 1 – 22 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 – 43 of U.S. Patent No. 6,360,262. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the instant case, all elements of claims 1 – 22 correspond to the claims of 1 – 43 of the patent claims, except in the instant claims the element “heterogeneous registries”, is referred in the patent claims as “list of servers”.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art to recognize that “heterogeneous registries containing heterogeneous access protocols that are associated with domain names” is equivalent to “a list of servers, each with a port number associated with a server resource object”.

Claim Objections

4. Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 4 recites, “...routing program routes requests to ones of a plurality of heterogeneous”. Replace “...routing program routes requests to ones of a plurality of heterogeneous” with “...routing program routes requests to **one** of a plurality of heterogeneous”. (**Emphasis added**).

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 1 – 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Guo et al. (U.S. Patent 6,912,582).

6. As per Claim 1, Guo teaches, "A computer system, comprising: an output device for providing information to a user; an input device for receiving requests from the user; a processor connected to said input device and to said output device to process requests and provide information; and a routing program executed by said processor, said routing program being connected to receive a user name, a user password, and a domain name associated with the user and to route requests for authorization according to said domain name" (Figure 1 item #100 – 112; Figure 4; Summary; Column 4 lines 25 – 63 and Column 8 line 55 – Column 10 line 32). Guo teaches a multi site user authentication system that provides automatic routing to a particular web site. The user provides confidential (authentication) information to the authentication server, which validates the user and directs to the appropriate service by retrieving the appropriate

location information from the authentication database to identify the location of the server providing the selected service (that is, location information of a selected web service for a given user based on user's domain).

7. As per Claim 6, Guo teaches, "A method for providing secure system access, said method comprising the steps of: receiving, from a user, a user name, password, and a domain name; using said domain name to determine an access protocol and an access registry that is associated with said domain name; and routing access queries from said user to said access registry using said access protocol" (Figure 1 item #100 – 112; Figure 4; Summary; Column 4 lines 25 – 63 and Column 8 line 55 – Column 10 line 32). Guo teaches a multi site user authentication system that provides automatic routing to a particular web site. The user provides confidential (authentication) information to the authentication server, which validates the user and directs to the appropriate service by retrieving the appropriate location information from the authentication database to identify the location of the server providing the selected service (that is, location information of a selected web service for a given user based on user's domain).

8. As per Claim 10, Guo teaches, "A computer program product on a computer readable medium, said computer program product comprising: a login routine for receiving a user identification, a password, and a domain name; and a router routine that receives authorization queries and routes said authorization queries according to

said domain name" (Figure 1 item #100 – 112; Figure 4; Summary; Column 4 lines 25 – 63 and Column 8 line 55 – Column 10 line 32). Guo teaches a multi site user authentication system that provides automatic routing to a particular web site. The user provides confidential (authentication) information to the authentication server, which validates the user and directs to the appropriate service by retrieving the appropriate location information from the authentication database to identify the location of the server providing the selected service (that is, location information of a selected web service for a given user based on user's domain).

9. As per Claim 13, Guo teaches, "A computer system, comprising: an output device for providing information to a user; an input device for receiving requests from the user; a processor that is connected to said input device and to said output device to process requests and provide information; a plurality of heterogeneous registries, each of said registries being associated with a corresponding access protocol; and a routing program, connected on said processor to route authorization requests to a corresponding one of said plurality of heterogeneous registries" (Figure 1 item #100 – 112; Figure 4; Summary; Column 4 lines 25 – 63 and Column 8 line 55 – Column 10 line 32). Guo teaches a multi site user authentication system that provides automatic routing to a particular web site. The user provides confidential (authentication) information to the authentication server, which validates the user and directs to the appropriate service by retrieving the appropriate location information from the authentication database to identify the location of the server providing the selected

service (that is, location information of a selected web service for a given user based on user's domain).

10. As per Claim 17, Guo teaches, "A method for providing secure system access, said method comprising the steps of: providing a plurality of heterogeneous registries, said plurality of registries being accessed by a corresponding plurality of access protocols; routing authorization queries to a corresponding one of said plurality of access protocols" (Figure 1 item #100 – 112; Figure 4; Summary; Column 4 lines 25 – 63 and Column 8 line 55 – Column 10 line 32). Guo teaches a multi site user authentication system that provides automatic routing to a particular web site. The user provides confidential (authentication) information to the authentication server, which validates the user and directs to the appropriate service by retrieving the appropriate location information from the authentication database to identify the location of the server providing the selected service (that is, location information of a selected web service for a given user based on user's domain).

11. As per Claim 21, Guo teaches, "A computer program product on a computer readable medium, said computer program product comprising: a router connected to receive authorization queries and to route said authorization queries to one of a plurality of heterogeneous registries through an associated heterogeneous access method" (Figure 1 item #100 – 112; Figure 4; Summary; Column 4 lines 25 – 63 and Column 8 line 55 – Column 10 line 32). Guo teaches a multi site user authentication system that

provides automatic routing to a particular web site. The user provides confidential (authentication) information to the authentication server, which validates the user and directs to the appropriate service by retrieving the appropriate location information from the authentication database to identify the location of the server providing the selected service (that is, location information of a selected web service for a given user based on user's domain).

12. As per Claim 2, Guo teaches, "wherein said processor is a server" (Column 8 lines 6 – 16).

13. As per Claim 3, Guo teaches, "wherein said input device is a keyboard" (Column 6 lines 58 – 67).

14. As per Claim 4, Guo teaches, "wherein said routing program routes requests to ones of a plurality of heterogeneous registries" (Column 4 lines 25 – 41).

15. As per Claim 7, Guo teaches, "The method of claim 6, further comprising the step of determining if said access protocol that is associated with said domain name is in memory" (Column 4 lines 25 – 41).

16. As per Claim 9, Guo teaches, "The method of claim 6, wherein said using step determines an access protocol from a plurality of heterogeneous access protocols" (Column 9 line 45 – Column 10 line 27).

17. As per Claim 11, Guo teaches, "The computer program product of claim 10, further comprising a plurality of heterogeneous registries and a corresponding plurality of heterogeneous access methods to which said router routine routes said queries" (Column 9 line 45 – Column 10 line 27).

18. As per Claim 12, Guo teaches, "The computer program product of claim 10, wherein said router routine determines if an access method corresponding to said domain name is already in memory" (Column 9 line 45 – Column 10 line 27).

19. As per Claim 14, Guo teaches, "The computer system of claim 13, wherein said processor is a server" (Column 8 lines 6 – 16).

20. As per Claim 15, Guo teaches, "The computer system of claim 13, wherein said input device is a keyboard" (Column 6 lines 58 – 67).

21. As per Claim 16, Guo teaches, "The computer system of claim 13, wherein said routing program routes said authorization requests according to a domain name submitted by a user" (Column 9 line 58 – Column 10 line 11).

22. As per Claim 18, Guo teaches, "The method of claim 17, further comprising the step of determining if said corresponding one of said plurality of access protocols is in memory" (Column 9 line 45 – Column 10 line 27).

23. As per Claim 20, Guo teaches, "The method of claim 17, wherein said routing step routes said authorization query according to a domain name specified by a user" (Column 9 line 45 – Column 10 line 2).

24. As per Claim 22, Guo teaches, "The computer program product of claim 21, wherein said router routes said authorization queries according to a domain name received from a user" (Column 9 line 45 – Column 10 line 2).

25. As per Claim 5, Guo teaches, "The computer system of claim 4, wherein said plurality of heterogeneous registries are accessed by a corresponding plurality of heterogeneous access protocols" (Column 9 line 45 – Column 10 line 27).

26. As per Claim 8, Guo teaches, "The method of claim 7, further comprising the step of loading said access protocol that is associated with said domain name" (Column 9 line 45 – Column 10 line 27).

27. As per Claim 19, Guo teaches, "The method of claim 18, further comprising the step of loading said corresponding one of said plurality of access protocols" (Column 9 line 45 – Column 10 line 27).

Conclusion

Examiner's Note: Examiner has cited particular columns and line numbers in the references as applied to the claims above for the convenience of the applicant.

Although the specified citations are representative of the teachings in the art and are applied to the specific limitations within the individual claim, other passages and figures may apply as well. It is respectfully requested from the applicant, in preparing the responses, to fully consider the references in entirety as potentially teaching all or part of the claimed invention, as well as the context of the passage as taught by the prior art or disclosed by the examiner.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. See PTO Form 892.

Applicant is urged to consider the references. However, the references should be evaluated by what they suggest to one versed in the art, rather than by their specific disclosure. If applicants are aware of any better prior art than those are cited, they are required to bring the prior art to the attention of the examiner.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Pramila Parthasarathy whose telephone number is 571-272-3866. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00a.m. To 5:00p.m.. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nasser Moazzami can be reached on 571-232-4195. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-305-3900.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Pramila Parthasarathy
February 18, 2007.

